

wrote up *Panicum glaucum* for the Species Plantarum. We are all agreed that he included a mixture of 4 or 5 different species. What we should be interested in is what plant Linnaeus had *in mind* when he used the binomial. Fortunately, we have that information. Apparently Linnaeus soon became aware of the incongruity of *Panicum glaucum* in Sp. Pl. ed. 1, for in the tenth edition of his Systema Naturae (1758) he confined his *Panicum glaucum* to γ of the Species Plantarum, that is the *Panicum glaucum* or *Setaria glauca* of subsequent authors. In taking this action he was fulfilling the obligation of an author, who breaks up an heterogeneous group, of indicating to which part the original name should adhere in the future. Stapf states that Gronovius' plant (the basis for γ under *Panicum glaucum* in the Species Plantarum) is in the Linnean Herbarium labeled *P. glaucum* in Linnaeus' hand and is numbered 2, the number of the species in the first edition of the Species Plantarum. To quote Stapf: "There was now no longer any ambiguity as to what Linnaeus meant by his *Panicum glaucum* and the specimen in his herbarium which corresponded to the revised conception became its 'type'."

I wish to thank Dr. A. W. Evans for his helpful criticism of the manuscript.

OSBORN BOTANICAL LABORATORY, YALE UNIVERSITY

A NEW FORM OF RUBUS ALLEGHENIENSIS¹

LEONARD P. WOLFE, JR. AND ALBION R. HODGDON

RUBUS ALLEGHENIENSIS Porter, forma **rubrobaccus**, forma nov. Suffrutex, *R. allegheniensis* similis, sed fructibus longioribus cylindricis subrubrobrunneis, dulcissimis (vix acerbis), canis subflavo-viridibus differt.

One indeed should be brave to describe anything new in *Rubus*, particularly in the Blackberries. However, the authors feel that any genetically distinct entity, with very conspicuous features, and particularly with some attractiveness to the agriculturalist, should receive some recognition from the taxonomist.

This plant, although with many fundamental similarities to *Rubus allegheniensis*, differs strikingly from it in several ways.

¹ New Hampshire Agricultural Experiment Station Scientific Contribution 133.

The color of the stems which at first is noticeably lighter green in the primocanes changes later to a distinctive yellowish-brown in the fruiting canes. The canes also are taller than those of typical material in the general area. The most striking characteristics, however, are associated with the fruits. Their color on the Ridgway color scale² is designated as Brazil-red which fundamentally seems to be a mixture of red and brown. The fruits, moreover, are elongate-cylindric, exceeding in length those of the typical *R. allegheniensis* in this area, but appearing to be no broader. These characteristics combined with a remarkably sweet flavor devoid of much acid quality make this a very distinctive form which might conceivably interest those readers who are interested in cultivating *Rubus*.

L. H. Bailey³ in 1890 described the variety *albinus* of *R. allegheniensis* which, by some, might be thought to include the material under consideration. Fernald⁴ has reduced this variety to a form. This entity was characterized originally by Bailey among other things as being lower than the type and as having “—fruit small, creamy white, or amber-colored—” characteristics which do not apply to our plant.

The original collection was made on August 3, 1949, at the East Foss Farm, Durham, New Hampshire, about one mile south of the University campus. A colony of probably 100 or more canes occurred in an area of about 2000 square feet entirely bordered by typical *Rubus allegheniensis*. The specimens Wolfe-Latimer No. 87 collected at that time which are to be considered as the para-types are in the Herbarium of the University of New Hampshire. Later, on August 16, 1949, further specimens were taken. This collection Wolfe-Hodgdon No. 88 is selected as the type because both primocanes and fruiting canes are represented. This specimen is also in the University of New Hampshire Herbarium.

² Ridgway, R., *Color Standards and Color Nomenclature*, Wash., D. C. (1912).

³ Bailey, L. H., *Amer. Gard.* xi: 720 (1890).

⁴ Fernald, M. L., *RHODORA* x: 50 (1908).

The authors wish to thank Dr. Robert Foster, of the staff of the Gray Herbarium, for his assistance in the preparation of the latin diagnosis.

DEPARTMENT OF BOTANY, AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION,
UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, Durham, New Hampshire

Volume 52, no. 624, including pages 281-315, was issued 3 January, 1951.